

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 214 293

EA 014 556

AUTHOR Earle, Janice
TITLE Community-Based Learning and Service: The Impact of an Innovation.
PUB DATE Mar 82
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, March 19-23, 1982).
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Services; Cost Effectiveness; Curriculum Development; *Field Experience Programs; High Schools; *Instructional Innovation; Longitudinal Studies; Pilot Projects; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *School Community Programs; School Community Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Maryland; Replication

ABSTRACT

A two-year pilot study evaluated a curriculum innovation at one rural and one urban high school in Maryland. Called the Community-Based Learning and Service (CBLS) Program, the innovation involved placing large numbers of students during part of the school day with community sponsors where they could learn about and provide community services as an additional part of their instructional program. The evaluation research included participant observation, a survey of participating students, and almost 200 structured and unstructured interviews with teachers, administrators, students, and community site sponsors. Data were collected on the implementation of the CBLS program and on its impact, outcomes, cost, feasibility, and replicability. The evaluation results, says the author, indicate the feasibility of the CBLS program. Among the other findings are that teachers were most likely to oppose the innovation, while students, sponsors, and parents were satisfied; that CBLS changed teaching and administrative patterns but also improved student attendance and school-community relations; and that the innovation's replicability depends on teacher involvement, support from building administrators and the state, adequate sponsor recruitment, qualified staff, and orienting, monitoring, and counseling of students. A copy of the student survey questionnaire is appended. (RW)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED214293

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Janice Earle

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

COMMUNITY-BASED LEARNING AND SERVICE:

THE IMPACT OF AN INNOVATION

A Paper Presented to Division B, Curriculum Studies

American Educational Research Association

March 1982

New York City

Dr. Janice Earle

Maryland State Department of Education

Baltimore, Maryland

EA 014 556

Introduction

Although there is a wealth of literature on innovation in schools, there is little literature that examines the process of innovation. This paper presents the results of a two-year study that examines a curricular innovation as it affected two comprehensive high schools.

The purpose of this analysis is to discuss these aspects:

1. Some of the theoretical literature on schools and change;
2. The usefulness of a cultural perspective when examining the process of innovation;
3. What occurs when an innovation is introduced into a school;
4. How the innovation impacts on the school and on other parts of the system that constitute the school environment;
5. The critical factors that facilitate or inhibit the implementation of an innovation; and finally,
6. Some general observations on the process of innovation.

The Community-Based Learning and Service Program

The Community-Based Learning and Service Program (CBLS), the innovation analyzed in this study, was designed and initiated by the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) in April, 1979. Over the years, the MSDE has been interested in developing alternatives to traditional high school programs for secondary students.

In a policy statement adopted by the Maryland State Board of Education in 1976 entitled "The Mission of Schooling", it is asserted that,

schooling is the responsibility of self, family neighborhood, church, community and the many institutions which impact on our lives. It is not the responsibility of the school alone. Neither competency nor the personal qualities to which the schooling process contributes can result from schools alone. But schools can and should provide leadership to others.

This commitment by the MSDE to work with a variety of institutions to enhance the educational experiences of students has been advocated by others concerned with the intellectual, psychological and social development of adolescents.

1. A variety of studies on schooling and adolescents have concluded that most schools do not provide young people with opportunities for contact with the world of work or for organized service to others. They are, "knowledge rich, but action poor" (Carnegie Council Report, Giving Youth a Better Chance, 1980, p. 24). This report, along with other studies on adolescents and schooling, suggest that schools need to rebuild a sense of connection between learning, life, career options and personal development. 1
2. Youth unemployment is on the rise. At present, unemployment for black youth runs about 40%; for white youth the rate is about 20% (Task Force on Education and Employment, 1979). This means that paid employment is not available to enough young people as a way of testing reality or gaining needed job skills.
3. There is evidence that providing students with opportunities for participating in experiential or out-of-school learning, if well structured, enhances social, intellectual and psychological growth in young people (Hedin and Conrad, 1980; Hamilton, 1980; Crowe and Harvey, 1979; and Newmann, 1977).

Although a number of experiential programs were in place in Maryland at the time of the initiation of CBLS (Experience-Based Career Education and the Executive High School Internship Program, e.g.), the CBLS program was designed to expand the concept of building life skills and competencies through community experiences. To accomplish this, the CBLS program had three components--experiential learning, community service, and career exploration. CBLS continues to focus on these three components through the two pilot high schools in Maryland.

The purpose of the CBLS pilot was to determine the feasibility of providing large numbers of secondary students in the cooperating schools with an opportunity to participate in a CBLS program. This meant that participating students would spend time learning about and providing service to their communities as part of the regular instructional program. The MSDE agreed to fund the CBLS program in each school for three years, providing that the schools aimed at serving 50% of their population by the program's third year. In addition to funding, the MSDE also provided a program specialist to work with the program at the state level, to provide technical assistance to pilot schools, and to provide program evaluation.

The Public Schools and Change: A Theoretical Background

The literature on innovation and the schools is both extensive and diffuse. It is possible to conceptualize this literature as falling into three major categories.

1. That literature which views innovation as a technological problem. In much of this literature, innovations are "conceptualized as products or programs that are to be formulated, adopted, implemented, incorporated, and diffused" (Hawley, 1978).

Perhaps the best known example in this category is the work of Rogers (1962) and Rogers and Shoemaker (1971). In the latter work, the authors describe a model of diffusion of innovation containing the following steps:

- Step 1. Knowledge, where one becomes aware of an innovation;
- Step 2. Persuasion, where an individual forms a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward the innovation;
- Step 3. Decision, where one accepts or rejects an innovation; and
- Step 4. Confirmation, where one seeks reinforcement or reverses a previous decision if exposed to conflicting messages about the innovation (p. 25).

Research based on this model has been characterized by Richer (1975) as "black box" research because schools are viewed as nothing more than black boxes containing students. It is a linear, rational model of change that has often overlooked realities.

2. The literature which focuses less on adoption than on implementation. In general, this literature looks at both the innovation and its context, and analyzes conflicts and resistance that an innovation may engender.

In what is perhaps the most comprehensive study on the implementation of educational innovations, the Rand Corporation, under sponsorship of the U.S. Office of Education, began a multi-year study of federally funded programs designed to introduce and spread innovative practices in the public schools.

This study, which began in 1974, followed programs such as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Titles III and VII, Vocational Education Act, 1968 Amendments, Part D, Exemplary Programs, and The Right to Read Program (Berman and McLaughlin, 1974, iii).

According to the study, whether a project fulfills its stated goals is distinct from what changes actually occur as the result of the introduction of the new project. The major conclusion of the study, was that adoption of an innovative project did not insure successful implementation, nor did successful implementation guarantee long-run continuation. "The difference between success and failure depended primarily on how school districts implemented their projects, not on the type of federal sponsorship" (Berman and McLaughlin, 1978, p. vi).

Researchers that analyze the political nature of the process of an innovation's implementation (House, 1974; Kogan, 1978; and Gianquinta, 1978) highlight the degree to which the introduction of an innovation produces conflict both inside and outside of an organization. The process by which these conflicts are resolved determine the degree to which the implementation of any innovation will be successful.

3. The literature in which a cultural perspective is adopted to view the innovation process. Drawing heavily on the methodology used in anthropology and sociology, this literature concentrates on the cultural context in which an innovation is introduced and the ways that setting mold and influence the course of the innovation.

Advocating this perspective, Sarason urges critics of the schools to be sensitive to the unique culture of schools and not think and go about the change process as if they were in another setting entirely (Sarason, 1971, p. 20).

Wolcott uses an anthropological analysis of the "cultural dynamics" between continuity and change. He identifies the concept of "moity", one of two mutually exclusive divisions within a group, to examine the educational subculture. Teachers and technocrats are the two distinct groups that he identifies within the schools (1977, p. 116).

Goodlad views schools as complex social systems, and maintains that too many reforms are directed at a school's formal structure and do not take into account the informal structure--both its ways of functioning and resisting (1975, p. 60).

The cultural approach to innovation relies heavily on the methods of participant observation and interviews in an effort to describe what is "out there". It is an approach that examines not only the intended outcomes of an innovation, but unintended ones as well. It is this approach which has guided the present investigation, because it seems to be particularly beneficial when studying process. As Wolf and Tymitz (1979) state, the question is not only, "Did a program work" but "When such a program is introduced, what happens?"

The Evaluation Developed by the MSDE for the CBLS Program

The fundamental problem for the MSDE in introducing the CBLS program was to determine the feasibility of placing a community-based program into a comprehensive high school for at least 50% of the student body. This was the real challenge, as a number of small scale field-based programs already existed throughout the state.

If the program proved feasible, it was anticipated that the local education agencies (LEA's) in which the pilots were located, would continue the program after three years of initial state funding. It was also anticipated that this time period would give the MSDE sufficient information regarding the program's replication should other LEA's choose to initiate a similar type program.

Because the CBLS program provided a presence in the field for the MSDE, it was possible to ask a number of other questions as well. Therefore, a study was conducted which enabled the MSDE to:

- ° examine the process of innovation in two comprehensive high schools;
- ° determine the feasibility of the new program; and
- ° examine program implementation, outcomes, cost and replicability.

During the first year of the program's operation at both pilot sites, the focus was on the process of innovation. Data were collected primarily through participant observation and formal and informal interviews. Participant observation can

be used to gain a unique understanding of how a program affects the various populations involved (administrators, teachers, students, and community site sponsors in this case). In operational terms this meant that the program specialist spent at least one day per week at each of the pilot sites.²

During the first year, over 80 unstructured interviews were conducted in all with representatives from each population. Formal interviews were supplemented by numerous informal interviews, and the checking of information was both easy and frequent.

Although in no way a full scale ethnographic investigation, many of the techniques of ethnography were used to gather and analyze data. Such methods are useful when the situation is essentially uncontrolled and when one wants to examine process as well as results (Weiss and Rein, 1969 and Guba, 1978).

During the program's second year, the evaluation was formalized. Participant observation continued. Unstructured interviews continued. In addition, over 100 structured interviews were conducted with administrators, teachers, community site sponsors and students to assess program impact and to identify the factors involved in replicability.

During the second year of the program information was collected on:

- ° program implementation;
- ° program impact on students, school and community;
- ° program cost;
- ° student attendance data.

Program Implementation

During the first year, program implementation was monitored by on site visits and participant observation. During the second year, a process monitoring instrument was developed. Data were collected twice during school year 1980-81 on CBLS participants and activities.

The way in which the CBLS program was implemented at each pilot schools varied slightly. The MSDE had as a principal objective that both schools attempt to involve at least 50% of the student population by the third year of implementation. The program's structure, staffing and curricular tie-in were left up to the implementing schools. In addition, because of the State Superintendent's interest in and enthusiasm for service learning, both piloting schools were encouraged to include student volunteer services to the community as an integral part of the CBLS program.

During the second pilot year approximately 585 students participated in the rural site and 625 students participated at the urban site. Both sites thus involved slightly more than 1/3 of the student population, moving satisfactorily toward a goal of 50% participation by the third pilot year.

Both sites decided during the first year to hire two full-time program coordinators to develop procedures for recruiting and placing students, to contact site sponsors in the community who were willing to work with students, and to develop inservice programs for teachers to connect the program to the school's curriculum. Each site also hired a full-time secretary to maintain program records and provide staff support.

Students chose sites on the basis of possible career interest or a desire to provide service. While at the site, students were under the supervision of a community site sponsor.

After trying a variety of options, both schools decided that having students participate at site placements one day per week for 10-12 weeks provided students with a satisfactory community-based learning experience. Options exist at both schools for shorter term site placements also (between 1 and 5 days per semester). These short term placements are related to community needs. For example, students participated in the Special Olympics, registered voters and provided support for a neighborhood health fair.

During the second pilot year, both schools decided to provide more extensive and formal orientation sessions to students before site placements began. All program procedures were thoroughly explained, and the responsibilities of students, community site sponsors, and teachers were discussed. In addition, during the second year, both sites also decided to provide student seminars midway through the semester and at the semester's end so that students could have opportunities to meet in small groups and discuss their site placements.

Students at both schools were required to complete learning activities related to their site placements. At the rural site students completed Learning Activity Packets (LAP's). These consisted of a variety of activities either written by the program coordinators or negotiated by the student with the

program coordinator. They might consist of logs, interviews, or in some other fashion require the student to gather information regarding activities the student observed at the site. These were submitted to the program's coordinators at the end of the semester, and if satisfactorily completed, students were awarded 1/2 credit.

At the urban site, students negotiated a learning contract with an individual teacher and submitted a finished product to that teacher at the end of the site placement. Program coordinators frequently assisted faculty in the development of the contracts by suggesting activities or products for students to complete; however, the sponsoring teachers had sole responsibility for reviewing and grading student products. Approximately 30 teachers agreed to sponsor students during the 1980-81 school year. Students were not awarded CBLS credit, but were awarded extra-credit in the class of the sponsoring teacher, or were permitted to substitute the CBLS project for some portion of classwork.

At both pilot schools, the program operated on a pull-out basis. Students were required to make up the classwork they missed while at their site placements. The pull-out nature of the program caused disruption of regular classroom activities in both schools. Program coordinators needed to work diligently and closely with school faculty to provide them techniques for presenting information to a changing number of students and to involve them in the program by writing instructional materials,

developing sites, and monitoring student placements. Strong administrative support by the building principal was also required in both schools because of the nature and size of the program.

Current areas of concern regarding the program's operation include the following:

- ° An inability thus far to integrate the program into the schedule at either school:
- ° The difficulty of adequately monitoring large numbers of students;
- ° Maintaining faculty support so that CBLS experience are integrated into the school's program.

Program Impact

The material on program impact was based primarily on the almost 200 interviews conducted during the first two years of the program's operation. In order to analyze the impact of this innovation, answers to the following questions will serve as the framework for discussion.

Question 1: Who supports or opposes this program and does this change over time?

Responses indicated that school level administrative support was crucial to the implementation of CBLS. At both schools principals were very supportive. They saw the program as a chance to both expand options for students and to gain favorable publicity for the school. In both schools the implementation of the innovation was known to be a priority both to teachers and other administrative staff.

Pilot schools were required to work with central office staff as well as the MSDE. There are only 24 LEA's in Maryland, and most of them are large. Even the rural site had four comprehensive high schools in the LEA. The urban site contained 20. In working with the central office, the interests of the school and the larger administrative unit may or may not coincide. For example at the school level, the major objective was to get the program going; at the central office level it was to determine if it could be generalized to other schools within the LEA.

Students were quite supportive of the program. The attrition rate at both schools during the second year was about 10%.

Site sponsors and parents showed no major areas of discontent with the program. Site sponsors were concerned that students have clearly designated tasks and that students participate on a voluntary basis. They felt relationships between themselves and the program coordinators at the schools were excellent. Parents were enthusiastic about the program as long as they felt their children could maintain adequate school performance.

Teachers were the role group most likely to oppose the innovation. They had a number of reservations which included:

- ° How would students "make up" work they missed while at their sites?
- ° How could they manage classes with variable numbers of students?
- ° Would the program dilute academic excellence?
- ° Could students be adequately monitored and assessed?
- ° A perception that they were being "told" what to do by the administration rather than "asked".

Those teachers who took part in the intensive inservice activities related to the CBLs program perceived the program in a much more positive light. Those teachers who chose to get involved in the program's planning process or took part in monitoring students at their site placements were less negative as well.

Question 2: To what degree is the program seen as expanding options or offering alternatives?

Respondents indicated across role groups that this innovation provided expanded options for students and allowed them opportunities that were not present in traditional programs in the following ways:

- ° students gained valuable lessons in responsibility--others depended upon them in "real" ways;
- ° students could experiment with areas of career and avocational interest--they had a chance to test their abilities;
- ° participation in the program provided many students with the reasons for learning what they needed to learn in school;
- ° the program provided motivation for disaffected students;
- ° the program provided a chance to study an area in depth for motivated students.

Administrators, teachers, site sponsors and parents all acknowledged that this program provided valuable opportunities for students to have educational experiences sanctioned by the school that would not otherwise have been possible.

For those teachers who became actively involved, the program provided them too with an opportunity to explore the community of an area of interest.

Question 3: To what degree does the implementation of this program change traditional teaching and administrative patterns?

Results indicated that this program forced a more individualized curriculum, expanded the scope of activities for which students could receive academic credit, allowed students increased opportunities for decision-making, forced teachers into a more active teaching role, compelled the school to find a way to transport students to sites and permitted students to learn from other adults in the community.

Teaching patterns had to accommodate to increasingly individualized approaches to instruction because in reality teachers were faced with variations in class size because of the program. Strategies had to be initiated for managing this situation such as assigning students a "buddy" to let them know what had gone on in class, printing up a weekly or monthly schedule, etc. In addition, the role of the teacher underwent some change. Teachers who worked actively with the community-based program became resources and coordinators for their students rather than only imparters of information.

The following administrative patterns underwent a change as a result of the program:

- ° There was recognition that site sponsors would play an administrative as well as a teaching role.
- ° Site sponsors took over a counseling function for many students;
- ° The program forced administrative flexibility--it did not fit well into a traditional school structure;
- ° A new role--that of the school-based coordinator was defined.

Question 4: To what extent did the program form new linkages between school-community-students?

Both schools perceived an improvement in school-community relations. The program provided opportunities for community site sponsors to participate in the education of young people. Sponsors reported that they enjoyed the experiences and appreciated the very real help that the students brought to their organizations. Both schools reported that closer ties were forged with the community and that site sponsors took part in inservice programs for faculty, evaluated students' performance, and on occasion offered to provide orientation activities at the school for students before they attended their site placements.

Students had an opportunity to develop learner/teacher relationships with adults outside the school. According to the Student Feedback Survey administered during the program's second year (See Attachment A), students felt CBLS provided them with adult responsibility, an opportunity to do interesting things, doing instead of observing, clarity of directions, opportunities for discussing experiences with family and friends, receiving help when it was needed, and feeling a sense of contribution. These aspects of the program were most highly regarded by students. Low scoring items included having an opportunity to make important decisions, discussing experiences with teachers, and applying community learning in school. These may represent items which could be strengthened.

Teachers and site sponsors reported similar student benefits in interviews. These included gains in personal development, a chance to learn "real world" skills, and an opportunity to be treated like adults. Teachers reported, like students, that they did not always relate site experiences back to the classroom.

Question 5: Were there other, unanticipated impacts?

During the program's second year, it was decided to determine whether school attendance was affected by the program. Evaluation results indicated that school attendance could be considered a positive outcome of CBLS.

At the rural site, student attendance during the year was compared to their past attendance record in a historical assessment of attendance patterns. Attendance of current 11th graders in the program was compared to their attendance as 10th graders, before entering the program. The average number of days absent decreased from 17.80 to 13.62, a decrease of almost 30%. This improvement was statistically significant at the $p < .01$ level. However, during this same time period, the administration concentrated on improving school attendance in general. Therefore, it's not possible to precisely determine how much of this change in attendance was due to CBLS program participation.

At the urban site, approximately 10% of the school's non-participating students were randomly selected within grade and sex strata and compared with CBLS students for attendance

during the 1980-81 school year. The average days absent for the CBLS group was 28.61 as compared to 36.36 for the non-participating students. This difference was statistically significant at the $p < .02$ level. Finding significant trends at both schools suggests that the program may be having some influence on attendance. A similar analysis will be undertaken during the 1981-82 school year.

Program Cost

During the program's second year, a cost analysis was conducted. Both program and business office staff were interviewed. The two schools supplied actual cost data for the first two years of program operation.

The CBLS program was offered for less than \$200 per student during school year 1980-81. This figure included the development of instructional materials, student transportation, faculty inservice programs, CBLS staff development activities, and salaries.

In addition to funding received from the state, local districts contributed the necessary physical facilities and certain other expenses, such as equipment.

The major expense category was personnel, which included two full-time coordinators and a secretary at each school. During the first year of the program, the rural site also employed a bus driver/aide full time.

Program Replication

In order to address program replicability, interviews were conducted with state department of education personnel involved with CBLS, and with the principals and CBLS coordinators at each school during the program's second year. Results were then synthesized.

At this point, a variety of factors seem critical to the replication of any CBLS-type program. They include the following:

1. The critical importance of state support, not just in terms of funding, but in active technical assistance as well. The state provided staff training, continuing staff support, disseminated program information, served as a partner in the development of program policy and conducted the program evaluation.
2. The critical importance of administrative support at the school building level. If the program is not a school priority, it won't survive. The principal can facilitate any new program by communicating support to school faculty, helping solve logistical problems, and serving in an advisory capacity.
3. The active involvement of school faculty. The program should be seen as a resource to teachers. Ideally, the CBLS program should be seen as helping in the education of young people and in providing an opportunity for teachers in experiential education.
4. A well designed system for recruiting and orienting community site sponsors. A variety of means can be used to recruit sponsors including personal contacts, telephone, and giving presentations before community groups to inform them about the program. It is critical that site sponsors understand that students are volunteers, and that the program's purpose is educational.
5. The existence of a qualified CBLS staff at the school level. The program would have had great difficulty without program coordinators at both schools. They were responsible for developing all program procedures, developing sites for student placement, monitoring students, and involving faculty.

6. A mix of activities for students, including orientation, site placement, learning activities, counseling, and monitoring. One full day at the site for students for a period of 10-12 weeks seemed to work best. Where possible site experience should be approached developmentally, with group exposure first, followed by individual placement.

In conclusion, during the first two pilot years, the CBLS program demonstrated the feasibility of providing an innovative program which would involve large numbers of secondary students in the piloting schools. Questions for further analysis then become:

1. What ties between classroom and community best enhance community learning experiences?
2. Can such programs be institutionalized as part of the regular school offering?
3. Can such programs be disseminated to other districts?
4. Can such programs be incorporated into the state educational system?

The answers to these questions will take more time.

Some Observations on the Process of Innovation

The following observations represent some preliminary conclusions regarding the impact of the CBLS program on the two piloting schools.

1. Innovation does not take place in a linear, sequential fashion. There were periods of intense activity related to the implementation of the innovation as issues and concerns arose that needed resolution. Following these periods of activity were periods of relative quiet or even retrenchment. This non-linear sequence of implementation applied to both individuals and role categories.

2. The innovation which provides for a number of delivery alternatives is more likely to be successful than one which relies on one model. This variety will also ensure that the innovation in question will fit into the context in which it is placed. The MDSE plan for CBLS which called on piloting schools to develop implementation procedures appears to have been a successful one. Both observations 1 and 2 point to the validity of looking at the context in which an innovation is placed and the formal and informal factors that govern its progress (Sarason, 1971; Goodlad, 1975).
3. The innovation's chance of success will be enhanced if someone within the internal school structure has access to the relevant systems in the school's external environment. In the case of CBLS, the relevant systems in the school's external environment were the MSDE, the LEA central office, and connections to certain national organizations such as the National Center for Learning (part of the federal agency ACTION). The school principal can fulfill this role, but his/her energy is usually splintered by a variety of demands. The school-based coordinators in the CBLS program proved to be a critical factor as they fulfilled this role. They had school-based responsibilities, and were employed by the individual schools, but they also had access to other relevant systems or sub-systems which impinged on the school, such as the MSDE, the LEA central office, parents, community site sponsors, other school administrators, and students.
4. It is difficult for schools to initiate a major innovation on their own. In most cases, individual schools do simply not have the resources. There need to be both an internal (school specific) receptivity and an external stimulus (an idea, resources, access to resources) for innovation to occur.
5. The key person in the school who facilitates or inhibits the adoption and implementation of an innovation is the principal. This is consistent with a number of other similar findings in the literature (Sarason, 1971).
6. Innovation causes conflict both internally and with other systems in the environment. The amount of conflict increases in proportion to the degree that groups are affected by the innovation. There will be conflicts with other systems (the central office, e.g.) and internally (between administrators and teachers, e.g.). It is critical that some structure

be available to resolve the conflicts. The existence of school-based program coordinators mitigated this situation in the CBLIS program. In addition, because the program provided for joint planning efforts between the MDSE, the central office and the school, regular communication permitted the identification of problems, even if their resolution was sometimes problematic.

7. Teachers will resist innovation more than other sub-groups. Therefore a critical factor in implementation is a continuous, effective staff development program, along with a school-wide planning process that solicits and uses teachers' input. (Lortie, 1975; Wolcott, 1977). If teachers do not ultimately accept the value of any innovation, it will not continue beyond the period covered by outside financial support or beyond the protective umbrella of a committed principal.
8. Public high schools are remarkably resistant to structural change. Attempts to alter the schools' schedules at both pilot sites, confounded the computer capabilities of the central office in both systems. The large structure of Maryland's LEA's tends to impose uniformity on all schools within the system. The efforts of any one school to vary either program or structure creates both conflict and suspicion.

The use of ethnographic techniques in this study, such as participant observation and data recorded in field notes along with structured and unstructured interviews provided added richness to the evaluation of this innovative program. Only through the use of such techniques can the process of an innovation be analyzed, and the implementation of any innovation in a school setting be more clearly understood in all its complexity. Such analyses will permit us to explore more thoroughly the culture of public schools. This will yield, in turn, further information on why they seem so resistant to change.

NOTES

1. The following are those reports, listed in chronological order:
 1. Gibbons, M. The New Secondary Education. A Phi Delta Kappa Task Force Report. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, 1972.
 2. Report of the Panel on Youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee. (James Coleman, Chrm.) Youth: Transition to Adulthood, Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.
 3. National Association of Secondary School Principals. This We Believe: Secondary Schools in a Changing Society. Reston, Va.: NASSP, 1975.
 4. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The Education of Adolescents. The Final Report and Recommendations of the National Panel of High School and Adolescent Education. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1976.
2. For a thorough discussion of the role of the participant observer see Johnson, J.M. Doing Field Research. N.Y.: The Free Press, 1975.

REFERENCES

- Berman, P. and McLaughlin, M.W. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change. V.I.: A Model of Educational Change. Santa Monica, Ca.: Rand Corporation, 1974.
- Berman, P. and McLaughlin, M.W. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change. V. VIII: Implementing and Sustaining Innovations. Santa Monica, Ca.: Rand Corporation, 1978.
- Carnegie Council of Policy Studies in Higher Education, Giving Youth A Better Chance: Options for Education, Work and Service. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.
- Conrad, D. and Hedin, D. Some action learning models. National Association of Secondary School Principal's Bulletin, 1974, 58, 22-28.
- Crowe, M.R. and Harvey, R. J. Retention of Concepts Resulting from Learning by Experience. Columbus: Ohio State University. National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1979.
- Giacquinta, J.B. Educational Innovation in Schools: Some Distressing Conclusions about Implementation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, Toronto, (March 27-31, 1978).
- Goodland, J.I. The Dynamics of Educational Change: Toward Responsive Schools. N.Y.: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1975.
- Guba, E. G. Toward a Methodology of Naturalistic Inquiry in Educational Evaluation. In E.L. Baker (Ed.) CSE Monograph Series in Evaluation. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Hamilton, S.F. Adolescents in community Settings: What is to be Learned? Theory and Research in Social Education 9 (Summer, 1981), 23-37.
- Hawley, W. D. Horses Before carts: Developing Adaptive Schools and the Limits of Innovation. In D. Mann (Ed.) Making Change Happen? N.Y.: Teachers College Press, 1978.
- House, E. R. The Politics of Educational Innovation. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1974.
- Kogan, M. The Politics of Educational Change. N.Y.: Praeger, 1978
- Lortie, D. C. Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study. Chicago: U. of Chicago Press, 1975.

- Newmann, F. Education for Citizen Action: Challenge for Secondary Curriculum. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1975.
- Richer, S. School Effects: The Case for Grounded Theory. Sociology of Education 1975, 48 (Fall): 383-399
- Rogers, E. M. Diffusion of Innovations N.Y.: The Free Press, 1962.
- Rogers, E. M. and Shoemaker, F. F. Communication of Innovations: A Cross Cultural Approach. N.Y.: The Free Press, 1971 .
- Sarason, S. B. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.
- Task Force on Education and Employment. Clark Kerr (Chrm.) Education for Employment: Knowledge for Action. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Education, 1979.
- Weiss, R. S. and Rein, M. The Evaluation of Broad-Aim Programs: Difficulties in Experimental Design and an Alternative. Revision of a Paper presented at the American Academy of Arts and Sciences conference on Evaluation of Social Action Programs, May 2-3, 1969.
- Wolcott, H.F. Teachers versus Technocrats. An Educational Innovation in Anthropological Perspective. Eugene, Oregon: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon, 1977.
- Wolf, R. L. & Tymitz, B. L. Toward More Natural Inquiry in Education. CEDR Quarterly October, 1977.

ATTACHMENT A*

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Community-Based Learning and Service

Student Feedback Survey

This survey gives you a chance to express your feelings about the community-based learning and service program in which you have been participating. There are no right or wrong answers. Your feelings and thoughts are the important things in this survey. Your answers will help to improve the program. All answers will be kept confidential.

First mark your name, sex, and grade in the appropriate places on the answer sheet. Your teacher will give you further directions on filling in your identification number. Directions for answering the remaining survey items are provided on the following pages.

Thank you for taking the time to fill out the survey.

* The questions on this survey were adapted from material appearing in Conrad, D. and Hedin, D. Executive Summary of the Final Report of the Experiential Education Evaluation Project, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Youth Development and Research, 1982.

Directions: Read each of the following two questions. Darken the number on the answer sheet that most closely matches your answer.

1. How many community sites did you visit through the community-based learning and service program?
 1. one site
 2. two sites
 3. three sites
 4. four sites
 5. five or more sites
2. How many total days did you spend at community-based learning and service program sites?
 1. 1-5 days
 2. 6-10 days
 3. 11-15 days
 4. 16 or more days

Directions: Each of the following items is to be answered on a scale of numbers from (1) to (5). For example, if you strongly agree with a statement, you should darken the number (5) on the answer sheet. If you disagree with a statement, you should darken the number (2) on the answer sheet. Read each item carefully and then darken the number which is closest to your feelings. Remember to darken only one number for each item.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
3. I had adult responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I had challenging tasks.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I made important decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I discussed my experiences with teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
7. My ideas were ignored.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I did interesting things.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I got to do things instead of observing.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
10. I was given enough training to do my tasks.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I was given clear directions.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I had freedom to develop and use my own ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I discussed my experiences with my family and friends.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Adults at the site took personal interest in me.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I was able to do things which interested me.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I had different kinds of jobs at the site.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I never got help when I needed it.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I was appreciated when I did a good job.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Adults criticized me or my work.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I felt I made a contribution.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I've applied things I've learned in school to my community placement.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I've applied things I've learned in my community placement to school.	1	2	3	4	5

Directions: The last four remaining survey items allow you to more freely express your feelings about the program. Please answer these items on this page of the booklet.

23. What did you like most about your community field experience?
24. What would you change about your community field experience?
25. Would you participate in the community-based learning and service program again? Explain.
26. Other comments:

When you finish, rip this last page from the booklet and turn it in to your teacher along with the other answer sheet.